



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago  
**Loyola eCommons**

---

Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other  
Works

Faculty Publications

---

2015

# Payment Order for Cavalry Fodder: SB XIV 12116

James G. Keenan

Loyola University Chicago, [jkeen@luc.edu](mailto:jkeen@luc.edu)

---

## Recommended Citation

Keenan, JG. "Payment order for cavalry fodder: SB XIV 12116" in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 193, 2015.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).  
© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn, 2015.

JAMES G. KEENAN

PAYMENT ORDER FOR CAVALRY FODDER: *SB XIV 12116*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 193 (2015) 244–248

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

# PAYMENT ORDER FOR CAVALRY FODDER: *SB XIV 12116*

This Catholic University of America papyrus (Hyvernât inv. 372 = ICOR 75.73) was first edited by Leslie S. B. MacCoull as “An Account of Fodder for Pack-Horses”, *ZPE* 25 (1977) 155–158 with Tafel IV. It was subsequently reprinted as *SB XIV 12116*. At the end of the ed.pr., one of the *ZPE* editors, D(ieter) H(agedorn), proposed a different reading for the former lines 16–17 (now 17–18; see below, line 1 note). This has been accepted as correct and incorporated in the Duke Databank version of the text.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, re-examination of the original publication has suggested that other improvements can be made, these being sufficient to justify a revised edition and interpretation, without radical alteration of the text itself.

To begin, as Hagedorn noted, his reading invalidated the prosopographical links made in the ed.pr.’s commentary notes on lines 16 and 17 (p. 158), cf. on line 9 (pp. 157–158): “Durch diese Lesung würden natürlich die oben vorgeschlagenen Identifikationen hinfällig.” Doubts about prosopography would bring the originally proposed Aphrodito provenance also into question. On this, see G. R. Ruffini, *A Prosopography of Byzantine Aphrodito* (ASP Monographs 50, Durham, NC, 2011) 147 s.v. Christodoros 11: *SB XIV 12116*, “assigned to Aphrodito provenance on weak grounds”; likewise 272 s.v. Ioannes 201, 322 s.v. Konon 3, and 440 s.v. Pharismanios 1. Still further, the doubts about prosopography and provenance would lead to doubt about the year date of 587 proposed in the ed.pr. Ruffini, locc.citt., gives each time a queried date of 556, citing J.-L. Fournet, *Le système des intermédiaires dans les reçus fiscaux byzantins ...*, *Archiv* 46 (2000) 233–247 at 240; but the reference should be to 241 n. 18, where the document is simply declared to be “non datable”. Fournet later, in his “Liste des papyrus édités de l’Aphrodité byzantine”, in Fournet, ed., *Les archives de Dioscore d’Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte* (Strasbourg 2008) 338, does propose the queried 556 that Ruffini uses; but, as the HGV notes, this is a mistake (“versehentlich”) for 557 (see below, note on line 13), and in any case, as Fournet observes, would only be valid if the document were linked by prosopography to Aphrodito. Consequently, in terms of prosopography, provenance, and date, the setting of the papyrus has become far less certain than originally proposed. Even the document type begs reconsideration. For this (line 1 note) and other issues, the reader is referred to the commentary below.

The top of the papyrus is lost. The left edge is otherwise preserved complete. The right edge is perfect from line 14 to the end, slightly damaged from lines 7 to 13, and lost above that. The writing tends to run close to both those edges. The bottom margin, complete at the lower left, is ca. 1.8 cm. The first hand exhibits a fondness for abbreviations in monogrammatic form, with tau directly above upsilon in αὐτ(ῶν/-οῦ) (lines 3, 4, 8, 11), eta above mu in μῆ(ῶν) (lines 3, 8, 10), and pi above upsilon in ὑπ(έρ) (line 8). For the switch from first to second hands, see line 12 note.

The papyrus preserves no sheet join. An image, kindly supplied by Dr. Monica J. Blanchard, Curator, Semitics/ICOR Collections in the Mullen Library at Catholic University, shows that the papyrus has its back glued to cardboard. The cardboard has been partly removed, leaving behind a Rorschach pattern of gray and white. In places the papyrus itself can be seen, but no traces of writing.

I am grateful to Chrysi Kotsifou for drawing my attention to this papyrus and securing a fresh image of the front, and to Dr. Blanchard for permission to reproduce that image in this re-edition. Thanks also to Dr. Janet Timbie of CUA’s Department of Semitics for her kind and timely assistance. A special debt is owed to Dieter Hagedorn for his careful and fruitful reading of this article and for important improvements and corrections. Lingering or freshly introduced defects belong only to me.

<sup>1</sup> Accessible through [www.papyri.info](http://www.papyri.info); but Ἰωάννου needs to be added to the DDbDP transcription at the end of line 17 (now 18).

[illegible]

SB XIV 12116

7.2 cm. (W) × 21.9 cm. (H)

Prov. unknown

Sixth century

1 → ..[.].[  
 2 τοῖς ὑπ[ο]τεταγ[μένους]  
 3 (ὑπὲρ) καπί(του) ἵππ(ων) αὐτ(ῶν) (ὑπὲρ) μη(νῶν) γ [ἀπὸ Τῦβι]  
 4 ἕως Φαμ(ενῶθ) καὶ αὐτ(οῦ) ἡμερ[ησίως]  
 5 ἐκ(άστῳ) ἵππ(ῳ) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ[(μα) (ἥμισυ)]  
 6 ο(ὔτως).  
 7 Φαρισμανίῳ σπαθαρίῳ (ὑπὲρ) καπί(του)  
 8 ἵππ(ων) β αὐτ(οῦ) ὑπ(ὲρ) μη(νῶν) γ ἐκ(άστῳ) ἵππ(ῳ)  
 9 χόρ(του) ἄμ(ματα) με, γί(νεται) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ(ματα) ρ,  
 10 Κόνωνι ἐν Φαμ(ενῶθ) (ὑπὲρ) μη(νῶν) γ  
 11 (ὑπὲρ) καπί(του) αὐτ(οῦ) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ(ματα) μ[ε],  
 12 (2<sup>nd</sup> hand) γί(νεται) ὁ(μοῦ) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ(ματα) ρλε  
 13 μόν(α). ἐγρ(άφη) Τῦβι δ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ζ.  
 14 † χόρτου χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ(ματα)  
 15 ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα  
 16 πέντε, Τῦβι δ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἕκτης.  
 17 Φλ(άβιος) Χριστόδοτος λαμπρό(τατος)  
 18 κόμ(ε)ς δ(τ') ἐμ(οῦ) Ἰωάννου  
 19 σιτομ(έτρου).

2 ὑπ- pap. 3, 5, 8 bis ἵππ- pap. 7, 10, 11 (ὑπὲρ): ὤ pap. 12 γί(νεται) ὁ(μοῦ): γ// Ø pap.  
 18 δ(τ'): see line 18n.

“[... give/furnish?] to those indicated below for fodder ration of their horses <for> 3 months [from Tybi] to Pham(enoth) inclusive, daily for each horse [1/2] *am(ma)* of green fodder, thusly: to Pharismanios, *spatharius*, for fodder ration of his 2 horses for 3 months, 45 *am(mata)* of fodder for each horse, total 90 *am(mata)* of green fodder; to Konon, in (sic) Pham(enoth), for 3 months, for his fodder ration, 4[5] *am(mata)* of green fodder, (2<sup>nd</sup> hand) grand total of green fodder, 135 *am(mata)* only. Written Tybi 4, 6<sup>th</sup> indiction.

“† Of green fodder, one hundred thirty-five *amm(ata)*, Tybi 4, sixth indiction.

“Fl(avius) Christodot(os), most brilliant count, through me, Ioannes, grain-measurer.”

1 There are slight but distinct traces of writing at the extreme upper left, not reported in the ed.pr. At least one line, and perhaps several lines, must therefore be missing, subtracting the address or heading and operative verb form. That the document is not an account seems certain from its layout and its closing (lines 17–19), while, on ostraka, instances of τοῖς ὑποτεταγμένοις (line 2) as indirect object of δός (*O.Bodl.* II 2103.3–4, 2109.3–4, 2113.1–2, *O.Strasb.* 512.3–4, 513.3–4, 514.3, 515.2–3, cf. *O.Bodl.* II 2097.3) suggest this is likely an order for payment, with Flavius Christodotos as the issuing party and Ioannes acting as his intermediary. Something like παράσχου would also be possible, cf. *CPR* X 16.3: π(αράσ)χ(ου) (ὑπὲρ) καπί(ου), even likely given the general frequency of this imperative form.

3 καπί(του): also lines 7 and 11. The word is here treated (neuter rather than masculine; proparoxytone rather than oxytone) according to the discussion of J. Gascou, *Le table budgétaire d'Antaeopolis ...*, (in) *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin* I (Paris 1989) 279–313, at 292–295 = chapter XV in J. Gascou, *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* (Paris 2008) 309–349, at 327–331. For *capitum* as “fodder ration”, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Norman, OK, 1964), *passim* (Index 1487 s.v. *capitum*).

tus); further, F. Mitthof, *Annona militaris. Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten I* (Florence 2001) 232–234, 514–515, 541–542, 560. Whether *capitum* is a Latinism is uncertain. See the clear and concise discussion in I. Avotins, *On the Greek of the Novels of Justinian* (Hildesheim 1992) 115–116.

ὑπέρ): perhaps unnecessary before μη(νών), but see lines 8 (in monographic form with pi suspended above upsilon) and 10 (in symbolic form).

μη(νών) γ: the three months are Tybi, Mecheir, and Phamenoth inclusive (καὶ αὐτ(οῦ), line 4), that is, from 27 December, 28 December in leap years, until 26 March, the expected winter months for stable feeding on green fodder. See MacCoull 156, note on line 4 [= 5], cf. P.Iand. inv. 653 (T. Reekmans, *Sixth Century Account of Hay* [Brussels 1962]), p. 25: “From 1<sup>st</sup> Choiak until 30<sup>th</sup> Phamenoth (27<sup>th</sup> November–26<sup>th</sup> March) all the animals of the estate were either pastured ... or fed on green forage in their stables ...” See also Gascou, *Le table budgétaire 295 = Fiscalité 330–331*.

[ἀπὸ Τῦβι]: since the order is dated Tybi 4 (lines 13, 16), four days into the three-month period, one might consider entering delta (4) after the month name; but the calculations (45 units per horse over three months’ time) indicate that unless the sums are being rounded up, the full three months (lines 3, 8, 10) with their full 90 days are intended.

4 ἔως Φαμ(ενὸθ) καὶ αὐτ(οῦ): cf. *SB XVI 12488.13*, *Stud.Pal.* XX 85.2, *P.Strasb.* VII 696.4–5.

4–5 ἡμερ[ησίως] | ἐκ(άστῳ) ἵππ(ω) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ[(μα) (ἥμισυ)]: or ἡμερ[ουσίως] κτλ. As MacCoull observes (157, note on line 8 [= 9]), half a unit of fodder per horse per day results in the figure of 135 (in ciphers in line 12, written out in full in lines 14–16) for the three horses over the three specified months. Alternatively, the end of line 4 gives the total number of days of those three months (90) and this segment should be read as: ἡμερ[ῶν Ϛ] | ἐκ(άστῳ) ἵππ(ω) χόρ(του) χλωρ(οῦ) ἄμ[(ματα) με]: “[90] days, [45] *am(mata)* of green fodder for each horse.” For specification of the exact number of days after reference and in apposition to month dates, followed by daily rates, see, e.g., P.Iand.inv. 653 (Reekmans, *Sixth Century Account of Hay*), *passim*; *P.Oxy.* XVI 1920.3, 6, 9, 11–12; XVIII 2196.r.11; LV 3804.231; but in those examples the dates within and across the months are precise and the number of days required exact counting. That the three months in the present text amounted to ninety days would presumably have been obvious, requiring no adding up.

5 ἄμ[(μα) (ἥμισυ)]: ἄμ[(ἄξῆς) ἥμισυ], ed.pr., but the doubled mu in line 14, unless a mistake by dittography, or correct but uniquely there meant to signify a plural, suggests that the measure concerned here is the ἄμμα (also lines 9 *bis*, 11, 12) rather than the wagon-load (MacCoull 157, note on line 8 [= 9]). For the abbreviation at double mu in a context where it is clear that ἄμματα are meant, see *P.Bad.* [= *VBP*] IV 92.4, 8, 12, 16, and 17. For this square measure (= 1/64 aroura), see *P.Cair.Masp.* II 67151.106 note; J. Shelton, *Land Measures in VBP IV 92*, *ZPE* 42 (1981) 95–98; *P. Köln* VII 324 (“Metrologische Tabelle”) with Anhang III, pp. 183–185; *P.Bingen* 140.2–15, esp. 6–7. For calculation of fodder in this way (by a measure derived from a land measure, in this case the aroura), see *P.Oxy.* XVI 1920.14 and 16.

7 ΦαρισμαγίϜ: only pinpoint tops of the hastas of nu are visible. The name is Persian: MacCoull 156–157, note on line 6 [= 7]; *P.Sorb.* II 69 p. 54; spelled with epsilon (Φαρεσμαν-) rather than iota there and in *P.Lond.Copt.* 1077: L. S. B. MacCoull, *P.Lond.Copt.* I 1077: Taxes and Money in Seventh-century Egypt, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 67 (2001) 385–436; likewise in *BGU XVII 2695.30* (A.D. 608). It is not to be found P. Huyse, *Iranische Namen in den griechischen Dokumenten Ägyptens* (Vienna 1990) = Bd. V Fasc. 6a of M. Mayerhofer and R. Schmitt, eds., *Iranisches Personennamenbuch* (Vienna 1973ff.).

σπαθαρι(ί)Ϝ: according to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 1798, a *spatha* (sense 1b) is a broad-bladed sword (cf. *BGU XIII 2328.10*) and a *spatarius* (sic) someone armed with such a weapon. Cf. *LSJ* 1623 s.vv. σπαθή, σπαθάριος. In the papyri, σπαθάριος is found in both nominal and cognate adjectival forms; all but two of the references belong to the sixth or early seventh centuries. The word is not included in S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d’Egitto*<sup>2</sup> (Barcelona 1991).

(ὑπέρ): both tips of the oblique stroke of the ὑπέρ-symbol survive; the lunate portion is missing in a gap in the papyrus.

8 αὐτ(οῦ): αὐτ(ῶν), ed.pr.

9 At the end of the line there is (apparently) a large oblique stroke above qoppa; of uncertain significance.

11 αὐτ(οῦ): αὐτ(οῖς), ed.pr.

12 Ed.pr. notes, quite reasonably, a change to a second hand with the chrismon at the start of line 14 (old line 13); nevertheless it looks as if the second hand takes over earlier, at line 12. Except for αμS near the end of line 12, the new hand is generally larger and freer than the first hand.

13 (and 16): relevant sixth-century indictional years 6 are 512/3, 527/8, 542/3, 557/8, 572/3, and 587/8, but there are hints of the early seventh century in line 7 (see notes ad loc.). Tybi 4 is December 30 in non-leap years (512, 542, 557, 572), December 31 in leap years (527, 587). At the end of line 13, a (mostly) horizontal stroke, apparently a detached filler.

14 ἄμμ(ατα): αμμ (= ἄμαξαι), ed.pr.

16 ἰν(δικτίονος): there is an oblique stroke above the nu, perhaps the start of a superimposed delta that was never finished. For the date, see line 13 note.

17–18 Φλ(άνιος) Χριστόδοτος(ος) λαμπρό(τατος) | κόμ(εξ) δι(τ') ἐμ(οῦ) Ἰωάννου: Φλ(άνιος) Χριστόδοτος(ος) λαμπρό(τατος) | κόμ(εξ) δι(ἄ) ἐμ(οῦ) Ἰωάννου, Hagedorn; Φλ(άνιος) Χριστόδ(ωρος) ὑπ(έρ) <τοῦ> λαμπρο(τάτου) | κόμ(ιτος) (καὶ) ἐμ(βολάτορος ?) Ἰωάννου, ed.pr.

18 δι(τ') ἐμ(οῦ): δι(ἄ) ἐμ(οῦ), Hagedorn (preceding note). This is a close call on a minor point, but despite Hagedorn's citation of ἰν(δικτίονος) in line 12 (= 13) for palaeographical support, it looks as if the presumed iota is just a long downward extension of delta, designed to receive the abbreviation stroke, more pronounced in line 18 than in line 13, where ἰν(δικτίονος) is as usual abbreviated at delta in the same way. The elision of alpha is standard, in fact, overwhelmingly so, in Byzantine sign-offs that take the form “δι' ἐμοῦ NN ἐγράφη”. Apparent exceptions to the elision of δι' ἐμοῦ in this and in other contexts are mostly due to editorial resolutions.

19 σιτομ(έτρον): ἐγρ(άφη), ed.pr., but even with allowance for the looseness of the second hand as it scrawls this final, abbreviated word with plenty of room to spare, the supposed epsilon-gamma-rho, besides initiating an unexpected redundancy by the second hand (line 12 note), look nothing like their counterparts in ἐγρ(άφη), line 13. Instead, σιτο- with a V-shaped tau looks certain; with some hesitation I construe the long, slightly wavy filler stroke as signifying mu, a common point of abbreviation for this word. The σιτομέτρης is widely attested in the papyri; for some recent sixth-century additions, see *P.Lond.Herm.* 1. For his role, see, in brief, G. Rouillard, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1928) 131–135, esp. 132, 134.